

REMARKS / AGRUMENTS

Applicant(s) respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons set out below, and ask the Examiner for reconsideration.

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Gordon et al, US Patent No. 7024678.

Claim amendment

The independent claims 1, 9, 16, and 19 were amended to clarify the difference between the subject matter of U.S patent application 10/698,189 and between Gordon et al.

Some typos have been corrected (omissions of the word "non-" before the word "live" in several claims. From that specification it is clear that the word was omitted unintentionally).

New claims 20-27 were added, to clarify the difference between the subject matter of U.S patent application 10/698,189 and between Gordon et al.

No new matter is introduced by this amendment.

Response to the 35 U.S.C. 102(e) rejection of claims 1-19

Claims 1-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Gordon et al, US Patent No. 7024678.

The independent claims 1, 9, 16, and 19 were amended so as to substantially include the limitation wherein the providing of the non-live media stream is preceded by generating at least a portion of the non-live media stream in response to the request to provide the non-live media stream to the client.

Gordon teaches of providing a non-live media stream (a fast forward bitstream and a fast reverse bitstream) that are generated in a time multiplexed manner independently of any request, so as to be available to a multitude of clients that are expected to request such bitstreams.

The generating of the non-live media streams of Gordon is carried out before the clients request to be provided with fast forward or fast reverse views, so as to be available to the customers when the fast views are requested, generally assuming the many customers will request for substantially similar fast playing views (e.g. during a sporting event).

Gordon therefore neither teaches nor suggests generating at least a portion of the non-live media stream in response to a request to provide the non-live media stream to the client.

Therefore, claims 1, 9, 16, and 19, should be allowed.

Claims 1-27, which depend onto claims 1, 9, 16, and 19 should also be allowed.

It should be noted that the subject matter claimed in the newly claimed claims 20-27 finds supports in the specification, and further distinguish the differences between the disclosed invention and between the teachings of Gordon et al.

Conclusion

The applicant believes that in view of these arguments claims 1-27 should be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 18, 2008

/Oren Reches/

Oren Reches, Patent Agent #53506

Reches Patents,

Customer Number 69054